

REMARKS

This is in response to Office Action dated November 5, 2002.

In the Office Action the Examiner has objected to the drawings. In response, Applicant has submitted substitute drawings herewith. Should outstanding issues remain with respect to the drawings, Applicant invites the Examiner to so indicate.

The Examiner has objected to the specification based on the inclusion of claim numbers in the specification. In response, Applicant has amended the specification to remove those references and to correct other formalities identified by the Examiner.

The Examiner has objected Claims 118-137 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In response, Applicant has cancelled Claims 118-137 and substituted new Claims therefore. The new Claims are believed to remedy the concerns addressed by the Examiner in relation to prior the claims 118-137.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 119 and 134 under 35 U.S.C. §101, as claiming the same inventions set forth in Claims 29 and 31 of Applicant's prior U.S. Patent No. 6,386,599. As noted above, Claims 119 and 134 have been cancelled. New Claims have been added which are believed to avoid the double patenting of rejection identified by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 118, 120-133 and 135-137 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as anticipated by both U.S. Patent No. 4,762,348 to Matsumoto and U.S. Patent No. 5,411,302 to Shimada.

The newly submitted Claims are believed to be patently distinct over the Matsumoto and Shimada references.

As understood the Matsumoto reference latching and locking operations are performed via a combination of mechanical coupling and multiple motor driven functions. Reference is not believed to disclose or suggest construction wherein latching and locking operations are effected as a consequence of a single motor driven function, moving an indexing member that is mechanically coupled to latching and locking assemblies.

Shimada reference is understood to operate latching and locking functions utilizing a plurality of indexing members, e.g. 51,52, each separately operative to provide drive functions of the mechanism.

Applicant submits that neither of the cited references are believed to disclose or suggest an invention as set forth in the present claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful attention to the details of the Application and his useful comments thereon.

Present the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. Should any outstanding matters remain, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 5, 2003

By:



Bruce B. Brunda, Reg. No. 28,497
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
75 Enterprise, Suite 250
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656
(949) 855-1246